

Before the Board of Zoning Adjustment, D. C.

PUBLIC HEARING -- July 13, 1966

Appeal No. 8819 Victor Vashi, appellant

The Zoning Administrator of the District of Columbia, appellee

On motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried, the following Order was entered by the Board at its meeting on July 18, 1966.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF ORDER: August 24, 1966

ORDERED:

That the appeal for a variance from the lot occupancy and open court requirements of the R-4 District to permit roof over first floor rear porch for sundeck at 810 A Street, S.E., lot 16, Square 920, be granted.

From the record and the evidence adduced at the public hearing, the Board finds the following facts:

- (1) Appellant's property is located in an R-4 District.
- (2) The property is improved with a two story dwelling.
- (3) The lot has a frontage of 17.33 feet on A Street, S.E., a depth of 101.083 feet, and an area of 1751.818 square feet.
- (4) Appellant has heretofore erected a 4' X 9' extension to the rear porch which is used as a sundeck.
- (5) Some years ago appellant placed a plastic roof over part of the first floor porch. The plastic roof was subsequently removed.
- (6) By letter dated May 24, 1966, Mr. J. P. Stoddard, Chief, Construction Section, states that on April 18, 1966 building permit B 141877 was issued to repair and strengthen the existing first floor porch roof. This roof was a plastic awning projecting approximately four (4) feet past the end of the existing wood porch at the second floor level. "The covering of the uncovered open first floor porch caused your lot to be over-occupied."
- (7) There was opposition to the granting of this appeal. The record contains four (4) letters favoring the granting of this appeal and a petition containing eight (8) signatures asking that the appeal be granted.

OPINION:

The Board holds that the granting of this appeal will not substantially increase the prescribed lot occupancy for the R-4 District, and that the permission for the roof over the first floor rear porch for a sundeck will not be inconsistent with the present use and occupancy of the lot and will have no adverse affect upon adjacent and nearby property.

Further, the Board is of the opinion that the requested relief can be granted without substantially impairing the intent, purpose and integrity of the zone plan as embodied in the Zoning Regulations and Map.